Appl. No. 10/001,849
Amdt. sent January 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2005

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 and 18-33 are pending.

Claims 1, 4-7, 10, 11, 18, 21-24, 27-29, 32, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Schelling et al. (US Patent No. 5,706,097), Young-Il Choi et al. (article entitled "An Integrated Data Model and a Query Language for Content-Based Retrieval of Video") and Lowitz et al. (US Patent No. 5,485,554).

Claims 2, 3, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Schelling/Choi/Lowitz and Nielsen et al. (US Patent No. 6,055,542).

Claims 8, 9, 25, 26, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Schelling/Choi/Lowitz and Gibbon et al. (US Patent No. 6,098,082).

There are three independent claims among the 27 pending claims.

Claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method of generating a paper document comprising the distinct steps of (1) accepting user input identifying a first concept of interest, (2) analyzing the multimedia information stored by the multimedia document to identify information relevant to the first concept of interest, and (3) printing the multimedia information on a paper medium to generate the paper document comprising one or more printed pages, wherein information that is identified to be relevant to the first concept of interest is annotated when printed on one the more pages. See also independent claims 18 and 29.

Schelling et al. disclose a system that allows a user to compose an index print of index images. Schelling et al. disclose that the user personally selects a still image or a frame from a video sequence and creates a thumbnail for the still image or frame to be included in the index image. *Col. 3, lines 7-9* ("The operator picks out the desired frames from the motion picture sequences for the index print and saves the frames in a format such as a PICT file", *Col. 3, lines 33-36*). For an audio recording, the operator provides a text message instead of a thumbnail image to be included in the index image. *Id.* at *Col. 2, lines 64-67* and *Col. 3, line 18-20.* In addition, Schelling et al. teach that an index code may be added to each index image to label the index image (see Fig. 1, references 20 and 24). Also, one or more type indicator icons

Appl. No. 10/001,849
Amdt. sent January 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2005

PATENT

may be added to each index image to indicate the type of data (audio, video, etc.) contained in the corresponding data file (see Fig. 1, references 22, 26, 28, 30).

Choi et al. disclose a video data model that integrates feature-based model and annotation-based model. *Page 192, third paragraph.* In Section 3 of their paper, Choi et al. describe their video data model and disclose "free annotations." There, they describe a "video clip" as an arbitrary video segment at which a meaningful scene is described, and an "event" which expresses the content of the meaningful scene, where the information about who, when, where, and what are described as its attributes. *Page 193, last paragraph.* Choi et al., however, are silent on how the information for an "event" is generated. Given the specific nature of the information ("who, when, where, and what"), however, it would appear that such information must be provided by a user.

The Office action correctly notes that Schelling et al. do not disclose or suggest the recited "accepting user input identifying a first concept of interest." Furthermore, Schelling et al. do not disclose the recited "analyzing the multimedia information stored by the multimedia document to identify information relevant to the first concept of interest."

Choi et al. do not remedy the deficient teachings of Schelling et al. Specifically, Choi et al. do not teach or suggest "accepting user input identifying a first concept of interest" and then "analyzing the multimedia information stored by the multimedia document to identify information relevant to the first concept of interest." The event attributes of Choi et al. do not constitute "a first concept of interest" as recited in claim 1; the attributes are not concepts but rather are specific aspects of the video image describing the who, when, where, and what of the content of the video.

Choi et al. is completely silent as to how the "event" attributes in the free annotations are obtained, disclosing only that "[t]he information about who, when , where, and what are described as its attributes in *Event*." Last line spanning pages 193 and 194. Since such information as to who, when, where, and what is so very specific, at best, it seems that such information must be user provided. Regardless, no where in the reference do Choi et al. describe or suggest "analyzing the multimedia information stored by the multimedia document to identify information relevant to the first concept of interest." A review of Section 4.3 of the Choi

Appl. No. 10/001,849
Amdt. sent January 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2005

PATENT

reference cited in the Office action reveals a discussion of translating a query made in their proposed video query language into a query language of an underlying commercial database system. Respectfully, there is no discussion of the recited "analyzing the multimedia information stored by the multimedia document to identify information relevant to the first concept of interest."

As to the recited limitation for "printing the multimedia information on a paper medium ..., wherein information that is identified to be relevant to the first concept of interest is annotated when printed on one the more pages," Schelling et al. merely teach printing the "index print." Moreover, the index print of Schelling et al. does not include the recited annotations of the multimedia information relevant to a first concept of interest. Moreover, Lowitz et al. do not show "printing the multimedia information ..., wherein information that is identified to be relevant to the first concept of interest is annotated when printed on the one or more pages."

Lowitz et al. describe printing a frame of video in a video stream. As summarized in column 2, lines 50-56, Lowitz et al. disclose selecting a portion of a frame of an input video data stream as printable image data and processing the selected portion of the frame to correlate the selected the frame of the input video data stream using at least one identifier. As cited in the Office action, column 8, lines 35-42 of Lowitz et al. explains that:

> "the identifier can be used to establish an ordered list for sequential printing when multiple images have been stored into the video frame store 304 so that the frames can be reprinted in any desired order. The identifier permits the processing apparatus to keep track of the order in which each video image to be printed was tagged, independent of the order in which the images were captured."

The identifier does not constitute the recited "information that is identified to be relevant to the first concept of interest is annotated when printed on one the more pages." Rather, the Lowitz et al. identifier is merely a sequence number, and is not related to a user-provided "first concept of interest." Nor does the Lowitz et al. identifier constitute an annotation printed on paper that relates to "information that is identified to be relevant to the first concept of interest." The identifier is simply sequence information.

Lowitz et al. also disclose providing an identifier to indicate video effects, or sound effects, as disclosed in column 11, lines 44-50 and column 11, line 64 to column 12, line 7. Again, such identifiers do not constitute the recited "information that is identified to be relevant to [a user-provided] first concept of interest." Rather, the identifier simply identifies the type of effect (video, audio) that is present in the video stream or audio stream.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

George B.F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400   Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:cmm
60674787 v1